THEOLOGY

VOL. LXI JUNE, 1958 No. 456

Editorial

THE Report on *The Family in Contemporary Society* (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.) was, we believe, the last to be published in preparation for the Lambeth Conference, but it was, we hope, published soon enough to enable the members of the conference to give it their full consideration. It is not exactly a digestible morsel, for in order to do justice to the subject it was necessary to assemble and set out in appendices much complicated information about actual and prospective population and other trends in various parts of the world. The group which prepared the Report in England, and which numbered among its members eminent social scientists and other lay experts as well as theologians, was assisted in this respect by the supply of reports from groups in the U.S.A., Canada, and India. The whole of this preparatory work was based on the perception that no good purpose is served by enunciating theological norms unless they are related to the state of the world in which they have to be applied. And as regards the state of the world loose impressions do not suffice: it is essential to reckon faithfully with the most precise and dependable evidence that is available. The present Report is a methodological model to all who are concerned with Christian social ethics, or with practical theology generally, because of the thoroughness with which it has acted upon this perception. The issues of family planning and population control are thus discussed realistically, and the facts of the case are looked squarely in the face. Among the consequences that should result is wiser and more positive guidance about the use of contraception than the Lambeth Conference of 1930 was able to formulate. The Report's theological handling of this particular question is both profound and subtle, and may at some points be found obscure by readers whose minds are not cast in a highly metaphysical mould, but the conclusion is clear and it is in accord with what are already the findings of Christian common sense. No one, however, should be allowed to isolate the consideration of this question from the total context in which it now lies.

* * * * *

To the list of useful works of reference which we mentioned last month there can now be added *Vocabulary of the Bible*, edited by J. J. Von Allmen, and published by the Lutterworth Press (30s.). This is a translation of a work by a team of Swiss and French Protestant scholars. It is similar in character to *A Theological Wordbook of the Bible*. That is to say, it does not profess to be a complete Bible dictionary, but contains articles on a large number of the principal words that are used in the Bible. It provides abundant

enlightenment for the student, the preacher, and the general reader. The whole is in English, i.e. the general reader will not be oppressed by meeting Hebrew or Greek words, even in transliteration.

* * * * *

We welcome the appearance of *Prism: a magazine for the Church of England*[1] which, to judge from its April number (entitled "What's wrong with the Church?") will provide a forum where younger members of the Church can give expression to their discontents, their proposals for reform, and occasionally their naivety. Perhaps some of the ideas that will be debated there will later on find their way into the more austere and sober pages of THEOLOGY.

* * * * *

The Rev. G. F. S. Gray points out that the statement in our February number (p. 64) that "Korea has the highest percentage of Christians among its population of any country in the Orient" ignores the fact that the majority of the population of the Philippine Islands is professedly Roman Catholic. See the figures in *World Christian Handbook* 1957.

* * * * *

We are glad to report that the late Dr Wilfred Knox's *Meditation and Mental Prayer* is again in print (S.P.C.K., Seraph Books, 3s. 6d.). Originally intended for undergraduates, it is one of the best introductions to the subject.

* * * * *

With the June issue of *View-Review*, S.P.C.K. is sending out "A Theological Book List" on the lines of that formerly published by the Central Society of Sacred Study. It supplies brief information about some of the more important theological books that have appeared in English from October 1956 to March 1958. The intention is to publish such a list twice a year, provided that sufficient orders are received to make it an economic proposition. We frequently receive inquiries such as are best met by a book list of this kind, and we particularly recommend it to the clergy and others who from time to time are asked to suggest an up-to-date book on this or that theological topic. The general headings covered are "The Bible", "Christian Doctrine", "Apologetics", "Church History", "Biography", "Liturgiology", "Patristics and Scholasticism", "Pastoral Theology", "Philosophy", "Christian Sociology", "Comparative Religion", and "Christian Devotion". After the first two issues, which will be distributed free, the charge for two issues per annum will be 1s. 6d. including postage. Orders may be placed now with any branch of S.P.C.K., and will be welcomed so that the prospective circulation can be estimated.

[1] Monthly 1s. from S.P.C.K. bookshops; 14s. per annum post free from 7 Tufton Street, London, S.W.1.

Anglicans and Christian Reunion

THIS article seeks to register two convictions, to ask a question, and to address a plea to those who are responsible for guiding the discussions of Anglicans with other Christians.

I. The first conviction is that it is the will of God that all Christian people should be united in one visible and recognizable communion embracing doctrine, sacraments, ministry, and congregational fellowship.

Probably there is no Christian who denies that in some sense all Christians should be one. The issue is not whether we should be one, but what kind of unity God wills for us. It appears to be part of the climate of our time that everything tends to coagulate into huge organizations. There is no particular Christian interest in advocating that the Church should do the same. The Church cannot adapt itself to the requirements of the twentieth century without forming organs of consultation and common action on the local and national levels as well as on a world scale. This is simply a necessity imposed upon the Church by the facts of our situation. The danger is that this necessary development should beguile Christians into thinking that they are being led by the Holy Spirit, into the unity for which Christ prayed, when in fact they are merely being led by the spirit of the times into a kind of unity which everybody goes in for nowadays—from plumbers to palaeontologists.

This is not an imaginary danger. There are good Christians who think that in our national and world councils of Churches we have now *got* Christian unity. From this point of view the intransigence of Anglicans about intercommunion is regarded as only a regrettable survival from less enlightened days. But one does not have to be an Anglican to see that the unity of these inter-church organizations (for which I thank God with all my heart) is not the unity which we refer to when we speak of one Holy Catholic Church. The World Council of Churches has repeatedly and explicitly reminded its member churches of this. Co-operation in common projects of service to those in need, co-operation in schemes of training, common study of the great issues of faith and duty, even the deep experiences of fellowship which many of us owe to our participation in ecumenical meetings—all of these fall short of that total commitment to one another in a shared sacramental and congregational life which is of the essence of the Church. I am quite sure that the Holy Spirit is at work in these movements for inter-church fellowship, and that the things listed above are among the fruits of his working. But the fact remains that these things fall short of the fulness of churchliness, and that if they begin to occupy the central place in men's thinking about what it means to be in Christ, the result must be a drastic distortion of the Church's life and witness.

I believe that faithfulness to the revealed will of God requires of us that we should be content with nothing less than this: that all who accept Christ as Lord and Saviour should be recognizably one

family *in each place*, bound together visibly by the one baptism, by the reading, preaching, and obedient hearing of the word of God, by common participation in the Lord's Supper, by a ministry of word and sacrament recognizable by all Christians as the one apostolic ministry, and by a common congregational life in which there is freedom for the ministry of the entire membership in accordance with the gifts given by the Spirit to each. In that sentence I have underlined the words "in each place". The Church will not make good its claim to have the secret of atonement for all men with God and with one another, unless the truth of that claim is demonstrated in the context of ordinary day-to-day neighbourly relations. It is true that in this technological age the question "Who is my neighbour?" cannot be answered in terms of mere geographical propinquity. But quite certainly it cannot be answered in terms which ignore the man in the same street and the same village. The most fundamental issues that are involved in our unity in Christ are not encountered and overcome until we deal with them at the level of ordinary daily life and leisure. It is at the level of ordinary congregational life that church union becomes real, and at the same time costly. It cannot be too strongly insisted that a church union which is not costly, which does not involve the whole of our churchmanship in a searching encounter with the living God, is not worth having. A unity which leaves our Churches as they are and merely ties them together by some administrative device, fails to meet the real sickness of which our disunity is the symptom.

II. The second conviction is that the Anglican communion has a unique part to play in the task of reunion. It is often said that Anglicans are the people who provide most of the drive towards reunion, and most of the obstacles in its way. I can certainly testify that it was chiefly from Anglicans that I learned that the disunity of Christendom is a terrible sin. But, like other free churchmen, I was constantly affronted by the fact that my Anglican friends professed to regard me as a fellow-Christian, but excluded me from the Lord's Supper. I only slowly came to feel the force of their argument that to sever participation in the Lord's Supper from commitment to an indissoluble partnership in the life of the Church was a kind of promiscuity which must be rejected in the interests of true churchmanship. I came to see that both the Anglican concern about unity and the Anglican intransigence about inter-communion sprang from the same root in a deep concern about the nature of both Church and sacrament. I also came to see that the same truth was illustrated from the opposite side by the fact that free churchmen, who practised unrestricted inter-communion, showed on the whole so little concern about organic unity.

Let me add in parenthesis that I did not come, and have never come, to believe that the Anglican position on inter-communion was right, only that I came to see the force of the conviction on which it was based. If there is any "right" way for a divided Church to behave, I think it must include both mutual acceptance at the Lord's table, and a deep determination that this mutual acceptance shall be

carried over into the whole range of church life. We cannot be content to let go either of these.

Nevertheless, I do not think it can be denied that Anglicanism, with its deep sense of the Church as something given, something constituted by God and not by our faith or our participation, and with its episcopal ministry carried over from the ancient Church, has a unique responsibility in the task of Christian reunion. Surely there is no other Church participating in the ecumenical movement which could play the determinative role that the Anglican Church could play if it was wholeheartedly ready to lose its own separate existence for the sake of the wider unity of a Church catholic and reformed.

III. But this brings me to my question—What is, in fact, the Anglican policy in regard to Christian reunion? Is that policy aimed at organic reunion on the basis of something like the Lambeth Quadrilateral, or at something quite different? I hope I may be forgiven for saying that to an outside observer it seems that the present policy of the Church of England entails an abandonment of the great truth in this realm to which Anglicanism has borne witness, namely the indissoluble relation between sacramental fellowship and the total life of the Church. Unless I am completely misunderstanding the situation, the final result of the present discussions between Anglicans and Presbyterians and Methodists will be a series of episcopally ordered bodies practising promiscuous inter-communion with one another, but without any actual organic union. I submit that this will mean that we have lost what we have without gaining what we seek. Let me be specific.

(1) It is said that inter-communion will be a step on the way to full unity. The experience of the English Free Churches does not encourage one to believe that that is true. If there is a real passion for unity, and a willingness to pay the cost of it, inter-communion is the proper relationship of the Churches as they move forward to the fulfilment of their unity. But experience surely shows that inter-communion apart from any such passion merely slackens the tension of desire, and weakens the sense of the seriousness of what is involved in sharing together in the Lord's Supper. If, in one street, we have episcopal church No. 1 (Anglican), episcopal church No. 2 (Presbyterian), and episcopal church No. 3 (Methodist), each under a different bishop, related to a quite separate church organization, it is hard to see that the scandal of division has in any way been lessened in that street, even though the members are free to drop in at each other's communions. I apologize for that horrible phrase, but is the sense of horror quite out of place?

(2) I find it quite impossible to think that simply taking in episcopacy as a system of church government will produce the result that Anglicans hope for. It seems to me more likely that it will produce a merely administrative episcopacy. I have always remembered a moment in an ecumenical discussion when an Anglican had been commending episcopacy and trying to explain to the rest all that it meant to him. When he had spoken, a Presbyterian replied, "We would gladly have episcopacy if you come with it." Surely the wholeness for

which we pray cannot come otherwise than by our becoming a whole people. The healing which we need cannot be accomplished by merely piecing together our broken structures. It must be the whole body of the faithful that grows together into one. Episcopacy and presbytery and congregation will find their true unity when episcopalians and presbyterians and congregationalists accept one another and agree to share a common life, not before.

(3) Thirdly—and this is the most fundamental point of all—I cannot believe that this line of approach to the problem of reunion really faces the question of what our disunity means. It is, if one may venture to say so, an administrative rather than a churchly and pastoral approach to the problem. Our disunity is sin. We are divided because we have fallen away from Christ—all of us. Some of us have surely fallen farther than others. But on the penitents' bench comparisons are out of place. At the point of penitence we must accept and forgive one another as Christ has accepted and forgiven us. To lay down pre-conditions for reception is to violate the whole relationship of grace which God has established with us. We are rightly afraid of any easy-going relativism which pretends that one kind of churchmanship is as good as another. But to try to escape that by insisting on certain reforms in the other church before we can accept them as brothers is to fall into something as deadly as the relativism we are trying to avoid. To accept one another *at the point of repentance* is an action of a quite different quality from the relativism which we rightly condemn. It means that we acknowledge together our departure from the line of God's will for the Church, that we place ourselves afresh under his judgment mediated to us both by our mutual criticism of one another and by the events of the time in which we live, and that together we seek to learn what he wants us to be. Such acceptance is as far as anything could be from easy-going relativism. It involves the churches in searching self-examination and in far-reaching reformation. But it places things in their proper order —the order of grace—where conformity to God's will is the fruit of his acceptance and not the precondition. To reverse that order means to fall from grace. We know that this is true in the life of the individual. We find it hard to accept it for our churches.

IV. My plea, then, is that Anglicans should acknowledge the fact that this frank recognition of other churches, without hedging or reservation, is the only possible basis upon which any real work for reunion can be built. This does not mean saying that presbyterial ordination is as good as episcopal or that any liturgy is as good as any other. It is compatible with the most definite beliefs about what God does and does not will for his Church in the matter of life, order and worship. Nor does it mean the adoption of a program of promiscuous inter-communion unrelated to any serious program of reunion. But it does mean that, at the point of reunion, we accept one another simply and completely without hedging or reservation, as fellow-members and fellow-ministers in Christ by his pure grace.

I wonder whether Anglicans generally realize how much their fellow-Christians in other communions have been perplexed by what

has often seemed to be the lack of candour in Anglican statements on this subject. Statements have been made which seemed to the simple reader to mean outright recognition and acceptance, but which were subsequently found to mean something much less. The most shocking example known to me is recorded in the story of the Australian proposals for inter-communion. It was proposed to include in the formula regarding mutual commissioning of ministers the phrase, "It is understood that the acceptance of a wider ministerial commission does not in any sense imply re-ordination". To an ordinary Free Churchman this would naturally be taken as an assurance that the previous ordination was not being denied by the proposed rite. Subsequent discussion arising out of an accident in drafting revealed the fact that the purpose of the phrase was precisely to safeguard the opposite intention, namely that what is conferred in the proposed rite is not re-ordination but ordination, because there was no previous ordination at all. (The record is in *The Australian Proposals for Inter-communion*, 1948, pp. 47–50.)

I hope I shall be pardoned for saying that things like this make non-episcopal negotiators very wary in dealing with Anglicans. The event which finally made union possible in South India was the publication of a statement by the five Anglican bishops stating that from the date of union onwards they would be entirely willing and happy to receive communion equally from any presbyter of C.S.I. whether ordained episcopally or otherwise. Only such a frank and unambiguous acceptance of one another *at the point of reunion* can provide a basis for unity. I have underlined the words "at the point of reunion". I am not asking Anglicans to take an action which suggests that the things they have stood for are of merely relative importance. I am asking that we should all take as the basis of our approach to church unity the elementary evangelical truth that conformity to the will of God is the fruit of grace and not the pre-condition of it. This means that, however severely we may have to criticize one another for our failure to conform to the whole will of God for his Church, we do not demand of each other certain measures of reform as the pre-condition of acceptance. It means that when we turn together to God in an act of repentance, which includes a willingness to surrender our separate existences in order to put ourselves afresh under the judgment and mercy of God, *at that point* we accept one another as we are. That is surely the only method of Christian reunion which is proper to the order of grace.

LESSLIE NEWBIGIN, *Bishop.*

Two books have been published which provide useful background information about the Lambeth Conference: *The Bishops come to Lambeth* by Dewi Morgan (Mowbrays, 5s.) and *Church of Free Men* by Gordon Hewitt (Highway Press, 2s. 6d.).

Commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews[1]

Part I (for General Readers)

The Epistle to the Hebrews has acquired a reputation for being formidable and remote from the world in which we live, and is consequently left severely alone even by some who try to read their Bibles seriously. How can the Levitical sacrifices or the shadowy figure of Melchizedek have anything to say to twentieth-century faith? The opening words of Westcott's commentary (1889) may therefore provoke a smile: "Every student of the Epistle . . . must feel that it deals in a peculiar degree with the thoughts and trials of our own time."

And yet, are Westcott's words really so "dated" even now? Once a key is found, the forbidding door does begin to swing open—not enough, perhaps, to admit of easy access for the portly: we may still have to lay aside every weight; but squeezing in is by no means beyond our capacity.

To my mind, such a key is presented in its most serviceable shape by the late Dr A. Nairne, sometime Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. There is his small commentary in the Cambridge Greek Testament series (1918), and the still smaller one on the English text (Cambridge Bible, 1921). But best for English readers is the predecessor of these—*The Epistle of Priesthood*, written from King's College, London, in 1913.

Similar solutions are presented by earlier commentators, including E. C. Wickham in the Westminster series (1910). Wickham is clear and brief, but perhaps rather less interesting than Nairne; and another advantage of Nairne's book is that it discusses and assesses the position of the critical study of the epistle up to his date. "A while ago", he writes, "it became fashionable to see Gentiles, not Hebrews, as the readers to whom it was addressed. Now that is not pressed."

Nairne (following up the work of others, as has been said) postulates simply that the outbreak of the Jewish war in A.D. 66 must have led to a great upsurge of Jewish nationalism all over the world, with the result that Jewish Christians would have been sorely tempted to rejoin the ranks of orthodox Judaism from which they had come out. It is against this background, he thinks, that the epistle may be read, as an exhortation addressed to a cultured little group of such Jewish Christians, urging them that now is the moment for them to go boldly forward, not back. Such, indeed, the epistle argues, is the logic of Judaism itself: the Old Testament and its institutions, in fact, point forward to Christ. The Jewish war presents a crisis for their faith: it is now or never. To relapse is to have trodden under foot the Son of God. To go with him outside the camp bearing his reproach is to find the city which hath foundations.

Postulate such a situation; postulate a small "clan" of like-minded Christian Jews, well educated in the manner of thought which we

[1] For previous contributions to this series, see November 1957 (The Book of Isaiah) and April 1958 (The Acts of the Apostles).

associate with Philo and Alexandria, and much in the epistle becomes intelligible. Here, as Nairne shows, is a cultured mind, skilfully expounding a sacramental theology combining interest in the days of Jesus' flesh with the expectation of his future appearing. Here, we may add, is a powerful appeal to those who are being taunted by orthodox Jews as dispossessed, who are being subjected to cruel pressure—both psychological and physical (for actual persecution had been experienced earlier, and was again not far off)—in order to make them renounce their faith in Jesus. But, says the writer, so far from being dispossessed we *have* all that Judaism can offer and more, we *have* the consummation of the Jewish system: we *have* a great High Priest, we *have* free and confident access to the presence of God, we *have* an altar (from which, indeed, the non-Christian Jewish priests are excluded), we *have* our sacrificial system.

The whole epistle thus falls into intelligible shape as a dignified and exquisitely written appeal, whose literary beauty does not conceal its fire and passion, or its sensitive, tender severity. And though specially framed for a specific situation—a situation which helps to explain the drastic "no-repentance" passages—it states for all time the finality of the claims of Christ. Once placed in its original setting, it becomes available for us to-day.

It is difficult to resist here a digression into pure speculation. The speech of Stephen in Acts 7 contains certain easily recognizable likenesses to this epistle's thought. Now Stephen seems to have been in touch with a synagogue or synagogues in Jerusalem which included Hellenistic Jews (Acts 6. 9); and Stephen died prematurely, by a martyr's death. But so, it would appear, did the leaders of the group addressed in our epistle (13. 7). May not Stephen, then, have been among those leaders—Stephen who suffered "outside the city" (Acts 7. 58) like his master (Heb. 13. 13)? There seems to be no reason why this group might not have been part of the Christian "dispersion" which ensued on his martyrdom (Acts 8. 1; 11. 19). If these people had originally been evangelized, if not by apostles in person, then at least by such as Stephen, and if they had been robbed of their original leaders not by the lapse of time but by premature death, then the references generally assumed to imply secondary status and a late date (2. 3; 13. 7) can be accounted for without surrendering the date postulated by the theories of Nairne and others like him.

But to return to the books. E. F. Scott, in *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (1922, like *The Epistle of Priesthood* not a commentary but an interpretation), takes the opposite view. Acknowledging *The Epistle of Priesthood* as "a beautiful and suggestive book", he considers none the less that its approach is warped by the old presuppositions. "Not a word", E. F. Scott avers, "is said in the Epistle of apostasy to Judaism." The Epistle was written not to Jewish Christians but to a church in which "the old barriers between Jew and Gentile had disappeared", and from the heart of a period when "the church of the Apostles was transfiguring itself into the later Catholic church". The real danger was thus not apostasy, but failure to

remain steadfast: religion was becoming dull and mechanical. There is much that is valuable in this book, as in all that E. F. Scott wrote, but I fail to find this standpoint convincing.

More recently, Prof. William Manson of Edinburgh advanced a theory in some respects novel (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, the Baird Lecture, 1949). In the first place, he thinks that the group addressed were in danger not of falling back (thus far he would agree with Scott) but rather of never going forward: they were Judaistic Christians who had never properly "arrived". And, secondly, he associates Stephen with the writer of the Epistle (plausibly, as has just been observed). But more than this, he holds that the special significance of Stephen was a progressive, universalist, "missionary" outreach, and that this is what the epistle also is concerned to bring home to its readers. Now, the protest of Stephen's speech against a static, ritually conditioned Judaism is, I agree, a clear enough parallel to the burden of the epistle. But, although the logic of this is missionary expansion, it is not so clear that that is explicit; and as for Stephen's "Son of Man" utterance (Acts 7. 56), I fail to see how that counts as evidence for a "missionary" outlook. There is nothing, so far as I know, to suggest that this term became universalist until later (note St Paul's studious avoidance of it!). What is clear in the epistle is the stress on the danger of failing to recognize the limitations of Judaism and the finality and completeness of Christ: and this, it seems to me, especially in the light of the threats in Chapters 6 and 10, is better explained by the temptation to relapse and apostasy than by the temptation to remain static.

Of course, this is, in the last resort, a matter of degree. Nairne himself, and, before him, Westcott, had allowed that these Jewish Christians had not hitherto gone far enough, that they had too little realization of the sharp distinction between their own position and "the crudity of (the) Messianic expectation—so unlike Alexandrine piety", and that they needed to be called forward to the full meaning of their profession. But it makes a difference whether the alternative was to stay still or to go right back into non-Christian Judaism. However that may be, Dr Manson's book (which, once again, is not a commentary in the narrower sense, but a very readable discussion) is fresh and stimulating and has opened a door of understanding for many readers, including Dr W. Neil, who writes the excellent commentary in the S.C.M. Press "Torch" series, with warm acknowledgements to Dr Manson. I note in passing that he does recognize in the epistle a warning against apostasy, but relates it to paganism rather than Judaism (on 6. 3–8).

For readers of the English text, then, there are Nairne, *The Epistle of Priesthood* and the Cambridge Bible commentary; E. F. Scott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, W. Manson, the same, and W. Neil's commentary; as well as commentaries and articles in the one-volume commentaries and dictionaries. Mention must also be made of the new, many-volumed American Interpreter's Bible (Abingdon Press). The introduction to and exegesis of Hebrews by Prof. A. C. Purdy in this commentary (from a standpoint different from that

which is proposed above) is lively and informative and well worth using. One earlier English commentary deserves notice here, namely that by the distinguished Hebraist A. B. Davidson (1882), still very well worth looking at.

Part II (for Students)

On the Greek text—taking first the works written in English—besides Nairne's Cambridge Greek Testament commentary, already mentioned, there are two important larger ones—B. F. Westcott's (Macmillan) and J. Moffatt's (I.C.C.). Westcott's is, in some ways, the finest of his always magisterial writings. "When he reaps his field", wrote C. J. Vaughan of Westcott, "he leaves no corners of it for the gleaner." And yet it contains the extraordinary view that the community addressed must have lived where there was a Jewish Temple actually in use—almost certainly, therefore, at Jerusalem. It seems odd that an epistle based so manifestly on the *literary* foundation of the Greek Bible should be thus construed.

Moffatt, at the opposite pole, runs with those who do not even think the readers were Jewish. This is, in its way, equally queer.

But both these commentaries are magnificent for their learning and their comprehensiveness. An interesting comment on Westcott's is in Nairne's note on Heb. 10. 20. Westcott had preferred to interpret this difficult phrase as "by the new and living way which he hath prepared for us through the veil, *that is to say by* his flesh" (instead of ". . . through the veil, *that is,* his flesh"); and Nairne, while adducing objections to this interpretation, concludes: "the subtle nicety of the author's phraseology and the sanity of Westcott's judgment grow upon the patient reader". There speaks a just reverence for a very great commentator. An instance of Moffatt's exegesis, in this case (though not always) more ingenious than convincing, is in 13. 10, where (with the German scholar Windisch) he takes "those who serve the tabernacle" to be a figurative term for *Christian* worshippers, thereby helping indeed to find a single, intelligible theme running through the passage—but at what a price! This theory is, however, treated favourably by the late Prof. J. M. Creed in *Expos. Times,* L. 1 (October 1938).

Since an article on Hebrews has been mentioned, this is perhaps the moment to pay tribute to the illuminating chapter on the Eschatology of the epistle by Dr C. K. Barrett in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (essays presented to C. H. Dodd, ed. D. Daube and W. D. Davies); also to a suggestive article by the late Prof. T. W. Manson (not the writer of the book just discussed) in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (Manchester), vol. 32, No. 1 (September 1949), discussing very freshly the old problems of authorship and destination. But of cataloguing articles there would be no end, and we must arbitrarily call a halt.

Of the older English commentaries on the Greek text mention may be made of C. J. Vaughan's, full of wisdom and piety. It appeared in 1890, just after Westcott's, but was written independently of it.

But for anyone who reads French and succeeds in squeezing time to read it in quantity, a new treasury of learning and interesting debate has been provided by the great Dominican scholar C. Spicq in his two splendid volumes (1952–3). In the manner of the famous series to which it belongs, *Études bibliques*, it contains a leisurely and informative discussion of the work of predecessors, both Roman and Protestant, and a vast amount of useful material on all aspects of the subject, including a detailed comparison between Philo's thought and the thought of the epistle—a subject to which this commentator has devoted much study for many years. The professor himself inclines to think that Hebrews might have been written by Apollos (Luther's suggestion) to a very large community of Jewish *priests* (compare Acts 6. 7) converted by Stephen, and, after his death, exiled and living perhaps at Antioch. Very soon after Spicq's followed another French commentary of high quality though far less bulky, by the distinguished Protestant scholar Jean Héring. This is a good specimen of a most valuable series still too little noticed in England—the *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*, published by Delachaux et Niestlé.

Of the many German commentaries, the one by H. Windisch (1931) in the Lietzmann series presents, in compressed form, a great deal of useful linguistic material; perhaps more valuable still is O. Michel's (eighth ed., 1949), although it accepts a late date and postulates a situation which to me seems less convincing than the one I have indicated.

Of Patristic commentaries fine use is made by Westcott, who gives a classified list of them.

C. F. D. Moule.

Getting it Across

A study of vocabulary used by church people when dealing publicly with their beliefs.

The need for adequate communication faces the Church in every generation. Of eminent churchmen, some say that Christianity is already simplified enough and it is up to those who are being taught to make the final effort to understand; and others have been complaining for many years that the Church must suit its methods to the thought forms of modern times or be completely misunderstood and consequently rejected. Unfortunately, of those who come to grips with the problem of communication many act as if these two attitudes are opposed and spend years treading delicately between dogmatic theology and the jargon of Space Fiction. In fact, there are two fundamental truths about teaching anything to anybody: the teacher must not do the pupils' work for them; and successful teaching starts by building the unknown on the known. They are based upon deep respect both for the subject to be taught and the person who learns, neglecting neither at the expense of the other.

The Church has always been aware how important this respect is.

She would rather stand still than lead a single soul down the wrong path. But by her very nature she cannot stand still; only God has "arrived". Consequently she must always be reviewing her position, reorientating her plans and changing her tactics. Churchmen are now seriously considering this task, but first it is advisable for them to test the usefulness of their tools as honestly as possible, and then to sharpen blunt edges and develop new techniques to suit new situations.

The second most direct and most widely used method of communication is language. Generally speaking, a man learns by first watching action, which is then explained by speech and may later be represented pictorially. The result is that to most men only those words have meaning which represent experienced action. For ex- patterns of thought. "Virtue" is "doing someone a good turn, like milk-vans with chimney pots. It is the same with more complicated patterns of thought. "Virtue" is "doing someone a good turn, like getting in the coal".

Now it may well be that the Church in England, through her excellent desire to stabilize belief, has cherished the language she uses publicly, beyond its value as a tool and as if it was something static in itself, and so failed to communicate her Good News to more than a few educated or cultured enough to sort it all out for themselves. If it can be shown that this is so, it would partly explain the "gap" between most people and the Church. Language is a fundamental tool of communication, reaching intimately into all our relationships, and its misuse can do untold and unnecessary damage.

The examination begins with this as a provisional background. Next, in order to preserve the integrity of the findings, we must ask where are the actual points of contact at which most of our population encounter Church teaching?

The mass of the population of the United Kingdom (about 60 millions by 1960) do not now encounter much official church teaching at all. There are few explicitly Christian films or novels. The small number of Christian periodicals have limited circulations. The B.B.C. gives about 3 per cent of its annual sound and television time each year to acknowledged Christianity as such (far more than the average daily paper), and the average number of Divinity periods in all schools is about 5 per cent per form per year. Of the elderly, many (but not most) went to Sunday school and church when they were young and their answers about Church meanings are prefaced by "Oh yes, I remember". And of the young, very few are regular communicants of any church. These points of contact are supplemented by posters and placards on hoardings, notice boards, and advertising space in buses and tube trains; odd sermons preached by religious organizations at public corners; occasional glances into the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer; and rare visits to church buildings where they may sing hymns or hear the service.

Nevertheless, so successful have the English Churches been in standardizing their vocabulary that whenever the people encounter the Church's message it is nearly always couched in the same terms—

those of the Elizabethan Prayer Book. To most church people the vocabulary of the Prayer Book is not only adequate but necessary for Christian practice and prayer. The conclusions following suggest that it is no longer adequate and may well be damaging.

A questionary was compiled to test the understanding of this Prayer Book vocabulary. Forty words, including ten proper names and ten church festivals, were carefully chosen as representative and capable of drawing out the most information. Of the words, some could be called technical terms (e.g. Epistle, Resurrection, Oblation) and some were simpler (e.g. Saith, Peril, Repent). The ten festivals covered both those which most people who call themselves Christians could be expected to know about (e.g. Christmas Day, Good Friday) and those they should know about (e.g. Trinity Sunday). There was one "doublet"—Pentecost and Whitsunday—designed to show how deeply the knowledge went and how the form of the word could affect the understanding (e.g. Pentecost was often muddled with "holocaust" and answered as "plagues").

The questionary was presented in two ways—one in simple written form to a good cross-section of Secondary Modern School leavers (the majority of our people have this education), and the other in various combinations of sight and sound to about 500 people in the working-class areas of central London. With the latter the aural method secured the best results in spite of the difficulty of the educated accent of the interviewer, and visual testing alone often brought complete failure. Unfortunately the most elaborate precautions could not guarantee absence of prestige problems: one woman grew so "flummoxed" that she compensated for her ignorance of "Christmas Day" by saying, "What would the vicar think of me, now, not knowing what that was for?"; well-dressed "middle-class" women would think, fail and lash out rudely to questions which charwomen honestly admitted were "Quite beyond me, dearie"; men were more successful in groups and protectively scornful only when alone, whereas women of middle age who found themselves "in a fix" disliked companions to see it. Many, apart from the obvious importance of aural encounter, showed how many of their meanings are rhymed (e.g. Firmament—"Filament of a lamp?" Epistle—"A kind of Thistle plant?") and also how much more the understanding of church vocabulary depends upon the ability to read and write than do other forms of converse (e.g. the man who did not recognize "Epistle" could describe accurately and in great detail the significance of the word "Margarine").

Among the words were some round which Christian teaching is often built. The marks obtained at these crucial points were either low or nil. No one understood "Incarnate", over half failed at "Resurrection", and nearly all failed at "Trinity Sunday". Some words and names were consistently wrong and in the written test left blank (this turned out to be a useful check): Beelzebub was generally unknown ("Can't kid me—it's a plant"), so were Whitsunday, Lazarus, Advent, Pentecost, Firmament, Contrite, and Oblation. Mortify was misunderstood by nearly all, so were Bestowed, Succour,

Remission, Timothy and Nicodemus. It appeared from some answers that though the usual formulas might be well known, they meant very little (e.g. Beseech—"is a word you have in prayers and Psalm books—we beseech, O Lord"); Resurrection—"to be put to death" (presumably from "Resurrection of the dead"?); Mortify—"to preserve" (perhaps from "mortify the flesh", since flesh outside its specialized church meaning is what we seek to care for).

Of the two actual Elizabethan forms ("Thou" and "Saith"), "Thou" was answered correctly by nearly all, and "Saith" was only grammatically misunderstood, the verbal root "Say" nearly always being mentioned. But some gave further information which betrayed the mental background to these forms: Thou—"means a way in which they used to speak in the olden days"; "the word for you, used some time ago". If ideas generally associated with "olden days" are studied too, the result is very important: "olden days" is closely connected in the popular mind with "old-fashioned", "dead and buried", "*not like us*"; and it is this background against which Elizabethan forms have to operate. To most people, unused to church methods and not academically educated, "Thou" is not a term of special respect or reverence, even though they may recognize that to others respect and "thou" forms are related; and were they to use these forms it would be only as "the done thing", no leap of the imagination having taken place.

It seems it is dangerous to expect most people to have a mental or emotional background which is *necessarily consistent* with the beliefs of church people. This does not mean that most people use their words carelessly or in an unchristian way; it shows rather how much church vocabulary has specialized meanings of its own which are both unrelated to usual experience and invalid outside their own context (e.g. "the Flesh", which church people appear to deprecate in their services of worship and to preserve in their hospital work).

Other words used in the answers were generally simple and at times even suggested profitable, if less comprehensive, ways of expressing technical terms—"rub out", "own up", "to get rid of". Very few sophisticated phrases were used—e.g. "to humble oneself" (Repent); "departed this earth" (Ascension Day); "Praise" (Oblation); "Holy" (Incarnate); "to be lowly" (Repent). But all such answers were so much a matter of prestige or imitation that it would be unwise to draw conclusions from them alone. There does not seem to be any really valid objection to the more sophisticated phrases, with their rich vocabulary, except when they employ terms which are so comprehensive as to be vague. The fact that they are not generally in use is the fault more of modern converse and "Ad Mass" than of the sentiments themselves which would take on more vitality the more people used them. Nevertheless, it would seem unwise to *begin* foundations of belief in this way.

When the word was perhaps recognized but not understood the results were revealing. One person suggested that she had a church-going background—Psalm, "is a word which you have in your Psalm book in the evening". The same person gave for wrath, "is a piece

of material which Jesus had when he was born". (This recalled the Stepney lady who read "wrath" with a short "a", as in hat, and "recognized" the word as "temper" only after it had been pronounced for her. This seems to be the unfortunate meaning which most people give to Wrath of God when faced with it in print.) Pentecost was variously "Plagues", "the angel of Death"; Oblation was "wipe out", "miss out", "abolish", "something you get rid of"; Remission, "to give something back" (with a reference to prison sentence—a good reply?).

And beside this general pattern the individual errors were very many indeed: Resurrection—"to be put to death"; Incarnate—"priceless", "royal", "to give up"; Epistle—"religious teacher"; Succour—"a rude word"; Firmament—"something set solid"; Devices—"small useful gadgets"; Beseech—"to see"; Contrite—"converse", "true"; Psalm—"a kind of tree" (from palm—a written reply), "story", "verse", etc.; Advent—"the time Jesus was in the grave", "fasting after Easter"; Easter—"the coming of the Holy Spirit to the disciples"; Good Friday—"the Resurrection", etc.; Pontius Pilate—"a sailor and explorer", "a king", "hated Jesus and was always trying to put him to death"; Barabbas—"one of Paul's mates"; Paul—"a Roman soldier", "a religious writer", etc., etc. So there is no knowing what most people understand by most of the words they hear church people using to explain Christianity. Indeed, when they are heard to say, "Oh, it doesn't make sense to me, all that stuff", they mean exactly what they say. The total "failures" averaged from words, names and festivals was 66 per cent; the percentage for normal "Prayer Book" vocabulary alone being 75. Against such a background, subtlety and contrived technical forms (such as "Decollation") are hardly so much thought-provoking as misleading.

Fortunately some were correctly answered by most people: nearly everybody knew the purpose of Christmas Day and had some idea of Easter and Good Friday; Pilate, Iscariot and Herod (the villains) were remembered, though often incorrectly for being generally evil; "Midst" was often answered correctly and so was "Peril", both with the usual comments about "not our language".

It may be said that much of this misunderstanding is one aspect of general ignorance spread over a variety of subjects, and that had the questionary been subjected to a "Control" (as was the Leeds' Packer Inquiry of 1951 into the Retention of Religious Knowledge), it would have showed only that more efficient education is necessary. But this would be to confuse the issue and escape the solution of the real problem.

This questionary tested the methods of religious teaching and only indirectly its results. What has come to light is that church teachers are liable to confuse methods and aim, and should take care not to blame their own inefficiency upon the ignorance of the taught. The results of the questionary showed great ignorance not only of facts and technical terms *but also of the vocabulary usually employed to give the facts meaning.* It seems as if the explanations themselves now need to be explained. Take, for example, a poster declaring that

CHRIST IS THE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MAN at the centre of Stepney. This kind of quotation is often used to explain "Forgiveness of Sins", even though most people understand Sins to be "sexual promiscuity", and the muddle is thereby made worse, because sexual promiscuity is popularly the result of "Love". Moreover, in public prayer and worship references to all these technicalities are couched in Shakespearian English. This does not respect either "subject" or "pupil".

These are disturbing findings, but in order to test their extent let us examine the Book of Common Prayer and two well-used hymn books ("Ancient and Modern" and the "English Hymnal") in detail.

The Prayer Book represents the official forms of worship in this country, and as such it contains a wealth of Christian teaching and belief. It does not aim to render thought or meditation unnecessary, but rather it encourages them and inspires awe of God's supreme wisdom. Moreover, it is printed not in Latin but in English, so that it may be "understanded of the people", a necessity insisted upon by Paul in his first letter to the Corinthian Christians.

Nevertheless, a book as important as this, compiled for use by the majority of the population, from which they should be able to gain help and comfort, must not be *too* difficult. I have indicated both the important part it plays in the Church's communication, and that the present need for real, unaffected, explained worship must somehow be satisfied. If the Prayer Book is examined in the light of these demands, there are about 10,000 words and phrases, *without including* Elizabethan grammar, to which we could object.

Many words in the book are used to-day but not by most people: e.g. provocation (Venite), circumspectly (Ep. Trin. 20), residue (Thanksgiving in Pte Bapt.); many that most people do use, now have other connotations from those originally intended by the compilers of the book: affections (Ep. Trin. 14), bowels (Ep Trin. 22), suffer (Gosp. Bapt.), stool (Ps. 94), divers (Ps. 135), quicken (Ps. 119). There are phrases in "foreign languages": Sabbath (Catechism), Raca (Gosp. Trin. 6), *Φρόνημα σαρκός* (Art. IX), Beatus vir qui non abiit, etc. (Ps. 1 and the rest of the Psalter). There are phrases easily misunderstood, e.g. "At whose command the winds blow" (At Sea); and complicated arguments such as those used in the "Prayer for persons troubled in mind or in conscience", the "Visitation of the Sick", "Burial of the Dead" and "A Commination".

If we examine in this way the "Order for Morning Prayer" as it is published, we find the following difficulties; and, lost among them, some of the *necessary* "mysteries" of Christianity. (As printed here, out of their context, some of the words will not seem difficult and some more likely to be understood than others.)

Vocabulary used to-day, but not by most people: sundry, manifold, dissemble, devices, unfeignedly, provocation, acknowledge, abhor, wells, Creed, communion, endue, governance, replenished, plenteously, attain, felicity, with one accord, supplications, expedient, hallowed, everlasting, ascended. Words used by most people, but now with different connotations: places, pronounce, trespass,

magnify (this is an extremely dangerous word to-day, suggesting "make bigger than it really is"), lighten, fouls, wealth, quires, under, rose, quick.

Some Elizabethan usages: cloke, goodly, quires, marvels, alway, Catholick (also Elizabethan grammar, including such curious forms as wert, art, and wast).

Names: Israel, Ananias, Azarias, Misael, David.

"Foreign Languages": Te Deum Laudamus, Cherubim, Seraphim, Sabaoth, Benedicite Omnia Opera, Benedictus, Jubilate Deo.

Phrases easily misunderstood for one reason or another: *Daily* throughout the year, the throne of the heavenly *grace*, there is *no* health in us, *miserable* offenders, spare thou *them*, our mouths shall *shew* forth, *make speed* to save us, *strength* of our salvation, the *strength* of the *hills*, people *of his pasture*, change of person from He to I in Venite, throughout *all* the world, *abhor* the Virgin's womb, world *without* end (cp. "ends of the world"), winds *of God*, *children* of men, *raised up* a mighty salvation for us, *in the house* of his servant David, prophets which have been *since the world began*, *saved* from *our* enemies, that he would *give* us, before the *face* of the Lord, to prepare his *ways*, sheep of his *pasture*, into his *gates*, into his *courts*, all *devoutly* kneeling, *hallowed be* thy name, *which* art in heaven, *on earth* as it is in heaven, our daily *bread*, *lead* us not into temptation, *deliver* us from evil, *the* power and *the* glory, *shew* mercy upon, *save* the Queen, peace in *our* time, *safely* brought us, run into *any* kind of danger, always *incline* to thy will, *vanquish* and overcome all *her* enemies, *pour dew* of thy blessing, capital letters and punctuation in the Creed, pointing in Canticles and Psalms as printed, born *of* the Virgin Mary, *descended* into hell, *ascended* into heaven, sitteth down on the *right hand* of God, resurrection of the *body*, the threefold Lord Have Mercy, from thy *throne*, *through* Jesus Christ, Initial Sentences, and also the various difficulties encountered in the Psalms and the Lessons.

Complicated arguments: O Lord, . . . who dost behold all the dwellers upon earth . . . we beseech thee . . . to behold our . . . Sovereign . . .; Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of thy glory; All the earth doth worship thee.

Actual technical terms, including those which are not now thought of as such by church people: Scripture, absolveth, Amen, Canticle, Firmament, day-spring, Creed, Almighty, Communion, saints, Resurrection, Catholick, Collects, Advocate, Mediator.

It is also worth considering how these are encountered: sometimes at great speed (much faster than the rate authorized to conductors of questionaries), and all too often in an unusual, strongly "dedicated" tone, forcing upon the already difficult vocabulary an added "mystery" they often ought not to bear.

The hymn books have even more "possible difficulties" (about 35,000). Besides words rarely used to-day, such as "raiment" (English Hymnal 201), and those with different meanings, such as "foul" (E.H. 477) and "carbuncles" (E.H. 638), there are many complicated or indirect inversions, Hebrew and Latin phrases (*Φωστῆρες τῆς ἀΰλου,*

Sabaoth, E.H. 245; Miserere Domine, E.H. 89); and many images and forms unrelated to modern life ("nightly pitch my moving tent", A.M. 346; "when in the sultry glebe I faint", A.M. 179; "Sovran", A.M. 492; "wert", E.H. 161). But most dangerous of all is undue exaggeration, and "special effects", for example "hither the poor may repair, winning a Solomon's wealth" (A.M. 618), "worms of earth" (E.H. 161), or, "There is a fountain filled with blood drawn from Emmanuel's veins, and sinners plunged beneath that flood" (E.H. 332); and "Protomartyr" (E.H. 31), "their great Original" (E.H. 297), and "Paschal" (E.H. 123), "the Trisagion" (E.H. 245).

So far as sentimentality is concerned, most people do not object to it when it is based in *their own experience* and not in someone else's. But many of the authors of the last two centuries seem to have reacted against the industrial changes of their time and to have steeped themselves in the imagery of rural and feudal pursuits (e.g. banners, foes, darts, armour, robes, pastures, garden spices, feasts).

Before any conclusions may be drawn from this work, remember that we have been concerned with some 80 per cent of the total population of the United Kingdom. Our population is so great and our own personal experience so limited by time and space that a sidesman or a priest could easily exhaust himself deeply caring for those he knows or the "regular communicants", without ever crossing over to those whose thought-patterns and emotional background are entirely foreign to him. Our few churches could be filled over and over again without a single person from across the "Gap" coming inside. (When the *Eagle* held a carol service in St Paul's Cathedral the *majority* of children were turned away.) This together with the fact that three out of every four words encountered in official public worship are generally misunderstood summons theologians and teachers to an important task.

The liturgy of the Prayer Book is being examined. From what we have been considering it seems that a revision of "Arcadian vocabulary" as well, is dangerously overdue. For, unless they are careful, churchmen will make a literary exhibition of themselves and the people will go unsatisfied.

BERNARD MAYES.

Letter from Central Africa

THERE are eighty thousand white people and some two and a half million black people in Northern Rhodesia.

Roman Catholics have the biggest following among African Christians. The Free Churches are next. Anglicans, who arrived late on the scene and have always struggled with insufficient resources, come a long way down on the list. The non-Romans co-operate, especially in social matters, in a Christian Council. The Free Churches are now conferring with a view to full reunion among themselves. They have invited an Anglican observer to their discussions because, they say,

they do not want to take any step that will make ultimate reunion with Anglicans more difficult.

There are few African sects here such as abound in South Africa, where they are, at least in part, a protest against the doctrine of White Supremacy. In this country the great anti-Christian movement that drains off most religious disaffection, and much social and political disaffection, is Jehovah's Witnesses. Among Africans there are probably as many Witnesses as there are Christians of all denominations. The White leaders of the movement keep in the background, exercising their influence through pamphlets printed in the vernaculars. Control is loose, and local African leaders have wide doctrinal licence, so teaching and morals vary from place to place and from year to year. In this way a commercialized American religion presents itself to the dissatisfied African as an indigenous African religion over against the White man's religion of the Churches. And yet it is probably better to have one clearly defined opposition, recognized as anti-Christian, than to have the numerous sects of South Africa. Our Christian congregations are often strongest and best instructed where the Witnesses are most aggressive. The basic appeal of the movement seems to be the promise of the early return of the Son of God (not himself God), who will reverse the present world order so that Jehovah's Witnesses rule over all present leaders of Church and State. So it feeds on the same social frustration that inspires the sects in South Africa and political extremists here, while taking no actual part in political agitation. Witnesses have no need to revolt, as the returning Son of God will accomplish the revolt for them. So the Witnesses are often praised by Government officials troubled by agitators and by harassed housewives in search of well-behaved "boys". The fantastic text-juggling of the Witnesses tends to lead to an opposing fundamentalist text-juggling on our part. This accords with the bibliolatry of many Africans to whom all books are a new wonder, but endangers a balanced understanding of the Bible.

The Churches here are deeply involved in social and political questions. They pioneered educational and medical work, and that quite recently, and still manage perhaps 75 per cent of the schools. Prominent churchmen often represent African interests in state councils, and the Government is still sensitive to the Churches' approval or disapproval. It is the Church that has taught the Africans the dignity of men and their equality of worth, and so is ultimately responsible for the present agitation for a vote, a living wage and social recognition. Many African leaders recognize our involvement and are anxious to hear what the Church has to say on political and social questions. In a recent article a young African (a practising Anglican) stated: "Since the end of the last war the young African élite have taken a great part in the political affairs of the country, and most of them have neglected going to church. They give the reason that they have learned that the Church blinds you by saying there is no colour-bar in churches while this is in fact being practised." In fact, there is now little colour-bar inside churches, but a

great deal is practised by white Christians outside the church building, and this is the real scandal.

The official policy of Northern Rhodesia, and of the Federation of Central Africa of which this is a part, is Partnership. "Partnership" is a very imprecise word and it is a pity many Christian leaders have enthused over it without demanding to know its definition. Partnership is suspected by the Africans because so many politicians have hammered the point that in most partnerships there is a senior and a junior partner, and, of course, "for the foreseeable future" (a beloved Rhodesian euphemism) Africans will remain junior partners. The Africans, who outnumber Europeans by 30 to 1, do not see it that way. They believe they should predominate numerically in the Electorate and Government. As I see it, this outcome is the only alternative to a state of White Supremacy upheld by force, as in South Africa. In this African state Europeans will continue to hold a vital position, but not a privileged one either in politics or industry. The politicians' anxiety to "uphold civilized values" usually means upholding the Europeans' privileged position, but the Church is truly concerned to uphold these values, and so to bend all her efforts to see that African leaders understand and believe in them. She has recently recognized her duty to speak out against the doctrine of White Supremacy. The Christian Council has expressed its concern at the whole trend of legislation and race relations, and has condemned the Federal Franchise Bill which enfranchises so few Africans that the Africans call it an insult and intend to boycott the Federal Elections.

There is a rigid Industrial Colour-Bar in Northern Rhodesia, especially in the copper mines, where jobs below a certain level of skill (and remuneration) are for Blacks, and above it for Whites. The white trade unions on the mines hold out for the liberal-sounding policy of "equal pay for equal work"—but as at the same time they have hitherto done everything in their power to insure that there are no training facilities for Africans to learn skilled work, this seeming liberalism is bogus. Many economists have pointed out that the raising of African wages and their employment on skilled work need not depress European standards of living. But they miss the point. Raising African wages would depress the gap between these and European wages and may eventually eliminate it. It is this gap that gives the European miners their sense of privilege and superiority, and their power to be benefactors. The Church has given as yet no clear guidance in this sphere. We pay, we cannot help it, very low wages to Mission employees, and this perhaps inhibits us from condemning the Industrial Colour-Bar and its effects.

Although many Europeans are desperately anxious to maintain their privileged position, there is not much approval of the South African doctrine of Apartheid. The Church can speak, will be respectfully heard, and so can influence affairs. She has not, as in South Africa, "to make her forehead hard against their foreheads, as an adamant harder than flint".

Most of our African leaders graduate in the Copper-Belt towns.

Life in these towns (in spite of the collapse in the price of copper!) is characterized by the luxury-living of the European and the slum-living of most of the Africans. The races have no social contact worth speaking of. Although the African as houseboy, garden-boy, cook-boy or nurse-boy knows a great deal about the private lives of Europeans, his employer knows nothing of his servant's life in the compound. The African is usually treated as though he had no private life, and so as though he were not fully a person. His character is judged exclusively by his behaviour as a servant. He is a different kind of creature, and that is so even when, as is often the case, the employer is generous and just to his employee. (Note—the government tries to discourage the use of the word "boy", but it is still universal, even on Missions!)

What does the Church say to this social set-up?

There is no official and little unofficial colour-bar in churches. Separate churches cater for European and African in towns because they live in different areas and speak different languages. But there are often Africans present at the English services, and Europeans sometimes attend the vernacular services. Among Anglicans joint services are held on special occasions, such as an Ordination or a Synod, and in several places African priests celebrate the Eucharist for primarily European congregations and are made very welcome. The European congregations in several towns give generously for churches for Africans and pay the expenses of their catechists. The Church, then, like the society of which she is the salt, is divided into two groups. But in the Church there is more contact and tentative fellowship between the groups. We have yet to face the test of a single church, in, say, a small town where most Africans speak English, where inter-racial worship could be the norm.

We Anglicans are part of the Province of Central Africa, which includes Mashonaland, Matabeleland and Nyasaland. The Provincial Synod is inter-racial and there is no barrier to prevent Africans' being in a majority on it. The same is true in the Diocesan Synod, where already the African laity nearly equal the European laity in numbers. At the moment Europeans take the lead in debate, but there is practically no division on racial lines either in debate or in voting. Here is a model for the state! Here is the organizational framework of a non-racial Church. We cannot foresee the form of the coming Church, and it cannot be prefabricated. Separate congregations may continue for geographical and linguistic reasons in many places, and in themselves need not break the unity of the Church. Integration has been effected at the synodical level and is beginning at the parochial church council level. In some towns the African priest-in-charge of the compound church is an ex-officio member of the church council of the English-speaking church, and in fact we are moving towards joint church councils.

Over 40 per cent of the Europeans in this country profess to be Anglicans, but only a small percentage of the African Christians are Anglican. If African nationalism is much further aggravated by the "junior partner" taunt, the African state when it comes may be

intolerant of foreign institutions, and the racial constitution of our Communion may make it appear a foreign institution. We must therefore press forward with integration, handing over responsibility and authority *before* we think the indigenous people are ready for it; we must make the up-country churches independent of missionaries and encourage by every possible means African vocations to the priesthood.

Many missionaries are needed to hand on a balanced Catholic Faith to those fascinated by apocalypticism and bibliolatry; many missionaries are needed to train and retain African leaders; but most of all many missionaries are needed for a vital fifteen or twenty years to make the African Church independent of missionaries.

J. Kingsnorth, O.G.S.

"Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion"

A CRITIQUE FROM SOUTH INDIA

One of the preparatory documents for Lambeth 1958 put out last year was a pamphlet called *Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). This is a survey of the missionary outreach of the Anglican Communion at the moment, an estimate of possible future developments, and a compendium of suggestions for new measures which might be taken, especially in Africa and Asia. It may be of some interest to have comments on it from one who has worked for eleven years in South India. I should like to make it clear at the outset that these comments are relevant only to those parts of the Report which apply to India, or perhaps South-East Asia. On the whole, the Report seems to have been drawn up more with an eye to Africa than to Asia, and I am quite incompetent to judge its applicability to Africa. It is when Asia, and especially India, is specifically or implicitly included in the scope of the Report that I would query some of its findings.

One of the outstanding features of the Report is the role which it assigns to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the U.S. It looks forward to a period (admittedly remote) when this church may have become "the senior partner in the Anglican Communion" (p. 6), and on p. 27 it is obscurely hinted that this church may eventually take over the responsibilities of the Church of England in areas which it has hitherto left almost, or entirely, untouched. The logic of the argument suggests that these areas may include Africa and Asia. Now, if this is so, it must cause considerable alarm to Christians in India: we already have in India the spectacle of American money causing great havoc and no little corruption among certain denominations, especially in North India. If Anglicans in India and South-East Asia are likely to be exposed to the same temptations in the future, the Report is very wise to warn them beforehand. But is it inevitable? It will hardly be denied that the main reason why the

P.E.C.U.S. is likely to be influential in Asia is because it is (and will remain) richer than any other branch of the Anglican Communion. Must we accept the thesis that American money is bound to exercise a predominant influence wherever it is free to flow and in all spheres of life? Perhaps we may be forgiven if we see here a sort of ecclesiastical S.E.A.T.O. Should the bishops of the Anglican Communion not aim at establishing churches in Asia that are, financially at least and perhaps culturally also, neutral? Is American aid inevitable for the Anglican provinces in Asia? Do American Anglicans themselves believe that it is? Judging by the very sensible report made by the P.E.C.U.S. delegation that visited India in 1956, I would say that the answer is "No".

The impression conveyed by the Report is of a world denomination whose leaders are meeting in London, and whose membership is overwhelmingly western, planning a strategy which will profoundly affect Anglicans in India and South-East Asia. The word "strategy" is actually used on p. 5, perhaps unavoidably. Anglicans, whatever their world allegiance, have got to live first and foremost as Christians in India, in Pakistan, in Malaya, and so on. The question which, it seems to me, this Report does not face is this: in the present political and ecclesiastical state of the development of India *at least* is it going to help Anglicans in India to have the future strategy of their church discussed and perhaps planned at Lambeth? It is not perhaps sufficiently realized how weak is Anglican representation in South-East Asia now that half a million of them have entered C.S.I. The C.I.P.B.C. has recently made splendid strides in indigenous leadership, but even so it is only 365,000 in a population of three hundred millions. The Anglican Church in Burma, Malaya, and the rest of South-East Asia is weaker still numerically, and much less well endowed with indigenous leaders. In this area, outside the India-Pakistan sub-continent, is there a single indigenous diocesan? Surely in these circumstances to plan a strategy for these churches at Lambeth is to weaken their chances of growth, not to strengthen them, to take them away from those who can give them most help (their fellow-Christians in their own countries), in order to put them in a position where they are far more likely to accept Western leadership.

But by far the most disturbing element in this pamphlet, from the point of view of the Anglicans in South-East Asia in general and India in particular, lies in some of the proposals which are made at the end about future action. I mention four of these as seeming to me worthy of criticism. It is only fair to say that some other proposals are excellent, e.g. those contained on pp. 33 and 34. But this is a critique rather than an assessment, and we must concentrate on the points which seem to be debatable.

(*a*) The suggestion on p. 35 that a series of books for the Anglican Communion—including commentaries, a church-history, and a book on doctrine—should be published by S.P.C.K. The Report does mention the World Christian Books Series, but assumes that this needs supplementing for Anglicans. It does not mention the Christian

Students' Library published in India, some volumes of which have already been adopted by the Anglican Church in Hongkong I should want to ask: Who is going to write these books? If the answer is: Anglican scholars in U.K. and U.S., then they will be of little value. We already have plenty of popular books written in the West. But perhaps the proposal is that they should be written by Anglican scholars in India and South-East Asia. There are not many competent to do so, and those there are are already fully occupied in co-operating with the two schemes mentioned above, not to speak of the many schemes operating in the various language areas for producing literature in those languages. In India, at least, the time has long past when any one denomination can hope to "go it alone" in producing Christian literature. If this scheme were to be tried in South-East Asia it would only duplicate 90 per cent of what is already done.

(*b*) The suggestion on p. 36 that there should be a promotion of exchange between leaders of the "younger" branches of the Anglican Communion. Admirable in theory, but not in practice, in India at least, if it is to be confined to the one Anglican denomination. To put a concrete example: Is the Anglican Church in North India to have no exchange of members and students with the Church in Thailand just because there are no (indigenous) Anglicans in Thailand? Perhaps the Report does not mean this, but it could be inferred.

(*c*) The suggestion on p. 37 that there might be a Staff College, analogous to St Augustine's, Canterbury, in Asia. We may well ask: What is Bishop's College, Calcutta, for? If that is not a staff college for the Anglican Church in South-East Asia, what is it? It is doing an excellent job, but even there it is not easy to maintain academic standards or an adequate supply of national staff. Where else an Anglican Staff College could be located in South-East Asia it is not easy to imagine. Of course the missionary societies could decide to put one down anywhere they liked and staff it with missionaries, but this is not what is wanted, and is not in accord with the policy of the two great missionary societies.

(*d*) The suggestion on p. 38 that the successor to Minneapolis should be held in Asia (Africa is also suggested as an alternative). It seems to me that almost the whole of Asia may be ruled out. In North India, Pakistan, and Ceylon the Anglican Church is engaged in serious conversations with other churches about union. To hold a Pan-Anglican Conference there would be tactless in the extreme. Witness the effect of the Pan-Lutheran Conference at Tranquebar in 1956 on C.S.I.-Lutheran conversations. Presumably China and Burma would be ruled out owing to political circumstances. On the other hand, it would not seem appropriate to hold such a conference in a place, such as Singapore or Borneo, where the Anglican Church was not yet autonomous and did not yet have an indigenous episcopate. This leaves only Japan as a practical possibility, and no doubt if there is to be a "Minneapolis" in Asia, this is where it will have to be held. But do we really want these pan-denominational rallies

in Asia? The aim is presumably to introduce the leaders of the Church in Asia to the leaders of the Church elsewhere and to facilitate planning and mutual consultation. But Anglicanism has no monopoly of the leadership of the Church in Asia. I cannot forget the plea of an Indian Christian friend of mine, a D.Phil. of Oxford, and a first-rate theologian: "Give us the Church, but not your denominations!" The Anglican Communion has a vast amount to give to the Church in Asia, but I take leave to doubt whether holding Pan-Anglican Conferences in Asia (or anywhere else) is the right way to give it.

ANTHONY HANSON.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Right Rev. Lesslie Newbigin is Bishop of Madura and Ramnad in the Church of South India.

The Rev. C. F. D. Moule is Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

Mr Mayes, who was formerly a classics master, is now a student at the College of the Resurrection, Mirfield.

The Rev. J. Kingsnorth is Priest-in-charge of the U.M.C.A. station at Chipili, Northern Rhodesia.

Dr Hanson is on the staff of the United Theological College at Bangalore.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MARRIAGE OF THE UNBAPTIZED

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Most people are now aware that in the great majority of parishes it is not possible for a divorced person to be re-married in church, and requests for such a service are comparatively few, but a new perplexity arises with the increasing number of unbaptized persons who ask to be married in church. Most lawyers would, I think, assume that a parishioner has a right at common law to marriage in his parish church, but in some dioceses the incumbent is ordered to refer the case to the bishop. Frequently the incumbent has to make up his own mind or is asked to tender advice to the bishop. What are the factors that should govern a decision in this matter?

1. It would appear that every parishioner has a right to marriage in his parish church and that lack of baptism would not be regarded as an impediment, but I have not been able to trace a case in which this issue was explicitly decided. It would be a great asset if the meaning of parishioner were determined, because the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer place the obligation of Easter Communion, for example, on every parishioner. Does this imply the unbaptized as well? Another rubric forbids the use of the Burial Office for the

unbaptized. The Marriage Service assumes that the parties will be able to receive Holy Communion at the time of their marriage or at the first opportunity after their marriage. Although the right of the parishioner would seem still to hold, there is certainly a background assumption that he will be baptized.

2. There is a long tradition in the Christian Church which prohibits the marriage of a baptized person with an unbaptized person, though there have been papal dispensations, and apparently the Canon Law Committee of the English Church Union reported that a marriage between a baptized Christian and an unbaptized person was valid but irregular.[1] The basis of all this is presumably the fact that until a person has been baptized he is not capable of receiving any other sacrament, together with the undesirability of mixed marriages. If a priest gives the nuptial blessing to unbaptized persons he denies this principle, saving of course in cases dispensed by the bishop.

3. We are sometimes advised to use our discretion, but this is a dangerous policy. If we are to stand by a principle, e.g. the law of Church or State, we are on good ground, but we should be in a shaky position if we were to discriminate between persons on grounds of their disposition towards the Faith or the Church. Who could uphold this position if challenged in law?

4. A peculiar difficulty arises when one of the parties is a Baptist or a member of some other Christian body which does not make baptism obligatory, and it seems a great pity to refuse marriage to the practising Anglican in his own church. This seems a clear case for the exercise of dispensation by the bishop.

5. All these comments assume that the priest will exercise his pastoral care and that where there is a genuine desire for baptism he will instruct and baptize. These notes deal with the not infrequent case where there is no desire for membership of the Christian Church, but where often for a variety of reasons there is enthusiasm for a "church wedding".

6. It seems to me that, on the basis of dealing with people where they are, there ought to be a course of action which does no violence to the principles of either Canon Law or Statute Law, and which allows to many people just what is possible and at the same time what they desire. It is clear that the registrar's office frequently fails to satisfy because it is too informal, lacks dignity and does not easily lend itself to a white wedding. Many priests will have known the bride's mother who insists on a white wedding in church for fear of gossip! It seems a pity to embark on a rigorist course which may lose us many opportunities in the neighbourhood which might otherwise come our way.

What we sorely need is to provide for the unbaptized (and perhaps for some others for whom the Church's prayers are unsuitable) a Form of Service similar to the first part of the existing Service in the Book of Common Prayer, omitting everything that takes place

[1] See Arthur Macmillan, *What is Christian Marriage?* (1944), p. 57.

beyond the chancel step and concluding with, say, the Aaronic form of the blessing.

A properly authorized form of this character would be most valuable in securing that no principles were violated, that the officiating minister could properly sign the register that all had been done "according to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England", and might well serve to witness to the difference between a full church wedding and a wedding between two persons who were not both of the Church. At the same time it might well satisfy those who like to be married in church. It might be that in time the standard would be raised so that Confirmation was required for a full church wedding, which would bring us nearer to Prayer Book standards. It would be made clear, of course, that the chancel-step wedding was a valid marriage and that it would not be a means of accommodating divorcees.

Mill End Vicarage,
Rickmansworth.

Yours faithfully,
Geoffrey Edwards.

LAMBETH PRAYERS

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The prayers issued for use in connexion with the Lambeth Conference will no doubt be used in many churches. It is important that they be worthy of their association with the divine office; for by the prayers, no less than by the hymns and sermons, which the layman hears in church his theology and private devotional practice are affected. Of the seven prayers on the official leaflet only two can be used with confidence: the others, all new, are deplorable. They are amateurish in construction, feeble in intention, ambiguous in meaning, and doubtfully orthodox in their implied theology. With the Book of Common Prayer before them the compilers should have known that a collect is a unity within which the parts are balanced and closely inter-related; the intention robust, definite; the expression concise, clear; and the words selected and arranged, with that art which conceals art, so that they follow an easy rhythm and an inevitable sequence. The fitting into the framework of a collect of unrelated groups of words makes not a collect but a parody of it.

Let me illustrate by taking but one example, the second of the "Prayers for the Conference". This reads:

"Almighty and everliving God, who only art holy, who only art the Lord, giver of life, of whom alone cometh wisdom, truth and love: Pour out, we beseech thee, upon thy servants the Bishops, gathered in thy Name, the many riches of thy grace. Let thy presence be about them, and thy guiding hand upon them, that following only the Father's will they may lead thy Church in the faithful doing of the same; who livest and reignest with the Father and the Spirit, one God for ever and ever."

The prayer is addressed to our Lord; though one would hardly suspect it at first reading. He is appealed to under a curiously ill-

chosen set of attributes. *Almighty and everliving* belongs to God the Father; though the substitution of *everliving* for the more usual *eternal* may be an oblique reference to the risen Lord. *Who only art holy, who only art the Lord,* is from the final Trinitarian section of the Gloria in Excelsis, referring more probably (and more accurately) to the Father than the Son. *Giver of life* from the Nicene Creed is definitely an attribute of the Holy Ghost. *Of whom alone cometh wisdom, truth and love* is not true. Wisdom "came out of the mouth of the most high", that is, from the Father. Truth and love proceed from the Holy Spirit, as we sing "Spirit of mercy, truth and love". The doctrine of perichoresis may be stretched, but it cannot cover prerogatives limited by the phrase "of whom alone. . . ."

The petitions are puerile in expression. *Pour out . . . upon thy servants the Bishops . . . the many riches of thy grace.* Inevitably the mind forms a ludicrous picture of a bulging money-bag being emptied over the episcopal heads. And what, in any case, is the meaning of *many riches of thy grace*? Grace is being used in its primitive sense of "favour" rather than in the developed Christian sense as it is used in the Prayer Book, and with which our people are familiar. "Many riches of thy grace" is equivalent to "many kind gifts". If the gifts are not specified the petition is void for uncertainty; while to ask for many of them merely sounds greedy.

Let thy presence be about them, and thy guiding hand upon them. The significance of "about" is obscure. In the previous prayer God the Father is asked to be "present with" the bishops: a petition which might more appropriately be offered to the glorified, incarnate Lord. "About" has the sense of "around and apart from"; it might be allowed to mean "in the midst". The petition continues *and thy guiding hand upon them.* Clearly our Lord is being conceived as he was during his earthly ministry in the midst of his disciples, laying his hands on their heads in blessing. In the Sunday school that might be good enough; but it is an immature conception of the relationship that exists now between the Lord and his Church.

The object for which the petitions are offered is ambiguously expressed: that the bishops *may lead thy church in the faithful doing of (the Father's will).* It may mean that the bishops shall excel others in divine obedience: which sounds smug. Or it may mean that they shall be leaders of the Church (the whole Church) as a shepherd leads his flock: which is presumptuous. A sectional gathering of bishops cannot assume the prerogative which belongs only to an ecumenical council representative of the bishops of the whole Church Militant here in earth.

As a whole the prayer is unbalanced; the trivial petitions being over-weighted by the piled-up attributes of the preamble; and the balance is not restored by giving the prayer the traditional full ending. The Trinitarian formula belongs to a different level of thought from the simple conception of the Galilean Prophet.

The other four new prayers are all open to serious criticism. One hopes that in future the composition of prayers to be issued for general use in churches will be placed in the hands of those who are

qualified to write them; still more one hopes that the question will be asked, and asked again, by those responsible, "Are special prayers really necessary?" Why should damage grow to the hurt of the Church?

Believe me, sir,

Your obedient servant,

EWHURST RECTORY,
ROBERTSBRIDGE, SUSSEX.

KENNETH A. PEARSON.

SECT OR CHURCH?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

By saying that the basic characteristics of the Remnant are applicable to a great degree to the Order of St Benedict, Mr Thornton is surely admitting that his reorientation of Pastoral Theology is towards sectarianism. The answer to his question "Are the Benedictines a sect?" is that the Religious Orders are the means by which the genius of the Catholic Church has kept what would otherwise have become separatist bodies within the fold. As Macaulay wrote, "Place Ignatius Loyola at Oxford. He is certain to become the head of a formidable secession. Place John Wesley at Rome. He is certain to be the first general of a new society devoted to the interests and honour of the Church."

Even though it may not be true to say that the Benedictines are a "sect", it is certainly not true to say that they are the Church.

Yours sincerely,

TETBURY VICARAGE, GLOS.

W. S. LLEWELLYN.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By Philip Carrington, Archbishop of Quebec. 2 vols. Cambridge University Press. £2 12s. 6d. each.

It is first of all necessary to define what this work is, for it is not a history of the early Church in the same sense as Duchesne or Kidd or Lietzmann. The author takes the sources, arranges them in chronological order and gives a summary of what they say, together with ample quotations. He begins with Alexander the Great, comes quickly to the Ministry and Passion, and then begins to go into greater detail with the Book of Acts, the Epistles and the Apocalypse. Gently we pass from Hebrews to Clement, to stop awhile with Hermas and his ilk, and then the *Didache* brings Volume I, the First Christian Century, to an end quite abruptly at p. 501. Eusebius, whose voice had been heard before, now becomes our main guide to the literature of the Second Christian Century, that is, Volume II. At p. 460 it is declared "we have now reached the terminal point of our history, which is the year 230, having completed the fifth generation of forty years since the crucifixion". The last twenty-nine pages

cover a century almost and briefly round off the story to the time of Constantine. It looks as if the author is doing once again what Eusebius did—he too gives the episcopal successions in the great sees, the outstanding events in the history of the Church and of the Jews, a description of the notable leaders and writers, the heresiarchs, the persecutions; he too is interested in the emergence of the Biblical Canon. Archbishop Carrington also works on a roughly chronological basis; he uses the reigns of the Roman Emperors as one element in his chronology and the episcopal reigns as another, and fits the material into the framework as best he may. The work could be well described as "A New Eusebius" (though the use of such a title in any circumstance is almost blasphemous to many a lover of Eusebius, and a work has recently appeared which should have been called "A New Kidd").

Eusebius was a pioneer who must have spent years reading all the available literature. He had the genius to pick out a number of important topics and then he decided to fit them into the chronological framework which he had prepared earlier. This framework had the benefit of being an original work of scholarship and of giving the History some vague shape. It was also a means of marshalling the material with a minimum of effort. Partly out of the reverence a Christian often has for any original text, a reverence which he brings over to his study of documents from his study of the Bible; partly because he was very busy, and extensive quotations can be copied in by a scribe and a work completed with the utmost speed and minimum strain on the author, Eusebius gave us extensive quotations from the summaries of the documents. Eusebius had none of the help given to-day by the machinery of footnotes, appendices and cross-references. His History must have been terribly trying to read, and it must have required great patience and perspicacity on the part of the reader to see the wood for the trees. Probably in the fourth and fifth centuries it was the only way possible. Certainly Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret seem to have thought so, although Ammian and Zosimus had the inkling of another way. But one must ask whether this is the sort of thing one should do when a thousand pages are put at one's disposal by the C.U.P. in the twentieth century. One wonders whether there is much excuse for a writer not to digest and arrange his material so that he does not depend on chronology, paraphrases, quotations and hundreds of pages—unless it be accepted that busy prelates should still try to produce extended works of scholarship, though they know a lifetime of study without interruption can hardly qualify a man these days to write anything new in a field so ploughed over as that of the early Church. Certainly this method allows the production of fat tomes despite interruptions and shortage of time.

Having said this, let us turn to some of the merits of this work. The Archbishop, unlike Eusebius, is not restricted in his knowledge of the Church at large by the haphazard contents of the libraries of Caesarea and Jerusalem. He is able to give a full and balanced account of the non-Greek-speaking Churches, especially those in

Africa and the East. He also has a much more developed sense of the alleged need to appreciate the other man's point of view, and his account of the heretics is therefore less one-sided, if less robust, than that of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Eusebius and Epiphanius. As one would expect from the Archbishop's earlier works, there is a good deal which is new and stimulating with regard to lectionaries, liturgy and the feasts and fasts of the Church. Scattered over the two volumes one could find a most useful introduction to the pseudonymous literature of these centuries. Above all, there is throughout a pervading love and appreciation of the writings as works of creative art or of literary genius. They are treated with respect and there is none of the crudity of the worst forms of "criticism".

The Archbishop's command of the literature itself is impressive, and he manages to say something about nearly every work produced during those five Christian generations. It is not possible to be quite sure how thoroughly the tremendous modern periodical literature, especially in German and French, is known to the writer, for he in the main successfully avoids footnotes, and the bibliographies explicitly confine themselves to the original sources and books mainly in English. One grows suspicious of him in this respect here and there. For instance, Namphamo is surely not the African protomartyr (II, 291), nor is it any longer possible to say Tertullian was just a lawyer and had no philosophy (II, 433). Or, again, far from Ambrose having no Greek (II, 260), surely his sermons owed much to his ability to crib recent works brought over from the East. When he is dealing with persecution under Domitian (I, 377), one thinks one has found him out, but after a while, when he returns to Domitian (I, 398), he reveals that he knows that there is a strong case for denying that there was violent persecution in his reign. At the same time, in a book which has much to say about persecution, one would have liked a profounder discussion of the effect of social, economic and political factors on persecution, and whether really the basic causes for it differed once the Empire began to break up towards the end of Commodus's day. Still, one must thank the author for the new light he sheds on the subject by emphasizing the psychological and ritual contributions to the need of the Graeco-Roman people to see some poor victim done to death.

Another Eusebian feature of the work is the large number of long quotations from the original documents as well as whole pages of what seem to be paraphrases. The quotations appear to be the author's own translation, and when a large number of them were compared with the original they were found to be pretty accurate, even if a little slapdash in places. (It is difficult to find the originals sometimes, anathema be he who gives a quotation without full references!) Once the method is adopted the paraphrases can hardly be avoided, but possibly summaries would have made less "weary reading" (an expression used by the author concerning Hermas I, 407), especially for those who cannot "excuse themselves from the task of ploughing through his second volume" (used by him of Irenaeus, I, 312).

Let us not be ungrateful and let us not damn with faint praise—the book is a remarkable achievement and many an hour of joy lies before the student who comes fresh to the literary meadows of the early Church and can afford time to pick flowers with Eusebius and Carrington.

N. Q. King.

Legon, Ghana.

Systematic Theology. Volume 2. By Paul Tillich. Nisbet. 25s.

It is now seven years since Prof. Tillich gave us his first volume, which included a discussion of "Being and God". His critics accused him of substituting impersonal concepts for biblical categories, and in his introduction to this new volume he endeavours to answer this criticism, which he has also dealt with in a little volume called *Biblical Religion and the Search of Ultimate Reality*. That there is a radical contrast between biblical personalism and any philosophical ontology is undeniable, but man cannot be stopped from asking ultimate questions about the being of God and his own existential being. The central concept of this second volume is that of the New Being in the Christ.

Tillich calls his method a "method of correlation", i.e. questions that proceed from man's human predicament are given a theological answer, but this involves the element of revelation which was largely considered in the first volume. Now Tillich turns from Being and God to Existence and the Christ, but there is no logical or deductive means of passing from being to existence or from God to Christ, and this leads to a valuable discussion about the paradoxical character of Christian belief, and paradox is clearly differentiated from absurdity or nonsense.

For man the leap from essential being to existence is a "Fall" and leads to the condition of "Estrangement". Nearly half the book is concerned with the nature of this estrangement, far wider in scope than our usual concept of sin. Much reference is made to Genesis 1–3, and Tillich insists, as Brunner does, that to interpret the Fall as historical rather than symbolical is to misunderstand its significance.

Like Bultmann, Tillich makes great use of contemporary existentialist philosophy but, unlike Bultmann, while emphasizing the need for "deliteralizing", he does not advocate "demythologizing", for myth and symbol are the necessary language of theology.

More than once he employs Heidegger's striking phrase of man being "thrown" into existence. Man's existential situation is a state of estrangement. From Kierkegaard onwards existentialists have combined to combat the Hegelian conviction that the estrangement has been overcome. Existence is estrangement, not reconciliation. Like Berdyaev, Tillich sees that in this situation man cannot be creative, but rather ceases to be a person and becomes a thing.

From a state of "dreaming innocence", i.e. a state before actuality, before history, of potentiality, man passes to actuality, awakens and loses his innocence in experience, responsibility and guilt. "Adam before the Fall" is a symbol for the "dreaming innocence of undecided possibilities".

The marks of man's estrangement are profoundly set forth in terms of Unbelief (lack of faith), Hubris, and concupiscence. The Hegelian word "estrangement" is used not as a substitute for sin but to safeguard a misconception of sin as "sins", breaches of the moral law, and to emphasize that man belongs to that from which he is estranged and is not a stranger to his true being even when he is hostile to it and is judged by it.

Estrangement leads to self-loss and world-loss and so contradicts man's true being, his potentiality for goodness, and the result is a drive to destruction. The implications of this are worked out with great penetration, and it leads to a discussion of the New Being and the significance of the Christ as the bearer of the New Being. Man's attempts at self-salvation, whether they take a legalistic, ascetic, sacramental, emotional or doctrinal form, are subtly analysed, and with a definition of the word "Christ" the second section begins the Reality of the Christ.

Tillich's Christology is immensely stimulating even though one may not be altogether happy with it. Jesus the Christ represents the power of the new being overcoming the estrangement of existence by submitting to it. Here is seen the real significance of the Cross-and-Resurrection. It involves a very concrete acceptance of the real humanity of Christ or else he could not be said to have triumphed over the conditions of existence. The Church, it is said, has always been tempted to some kind of monophysitism, but is there a tendency in this Christology towards Nestorianism? (Nestorius is never referred to and does not appear in the index.)

The implications for Christology of biblical criticism and historical research are frankly faced, and Tillich is as sceptical as Bultmann when it comes to any attempt to derive a "Jesus in history" from the Gospels, but the conclusions are not those of Bultmann, because Tillich hopes to develop in his third volume the thesis that "the Christ is not the Christ without the Church" and to relate this central section on the Christ to the doctrines of the Spirit and the Kingdom, which are "really integral parts of the work of Christ". The chapters which discuss the Christological dogma and the work of Christ, the doctrine of the Atonement, are full of thought-provoking material. We are asked to consider in a new way the meaning of salvation.

If in the first volume Tillich had demonstrated that revelation is the reply of God to the human situation, now he has set forth that human situation in all its tragedy and shown that in the life of Jesus we can see the divine life at grips with this situation, being overcome by it and overcoming it, and so releasing for man the powers of the new being.

There can be no doubt about the value of this major work, which faces unafraid the thought and facts of life of our time. We await with interest the third volume, which will bring this impressive structure to completion.

BANGALORE. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

THE SCROLLS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. Edited by Krister Stendahl. S.C.M. Press. 35s.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. By H. H. Rowley. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Some of the most important and influential work on the Dead Sea Scrolls has been published in periodicals and is thus inaccessible to most readers. Dr Stendahl has performed a very useful service in gathering into one book a number of essays by different scholars and in translating them, where necessary, into English. Two hitherto unpublished papers have been added, and the editor has written an introduction. This book supplies the reader with discussions by reputable scholars of most of the important similarities, real or alleged, between the Scrolls and the New Testament. It is, however, a pity that more was not said about the messianic hope.

An essay by W. D. Davies examines the concepts of flesh and spirit in the Scrolls and shows where they resemble and where they differ from the thought of St Paul. Similarly, K. G. Kuhn discusses the affinities between the New Testament concepts of sin, flesh and *peirasmos* and the beliefs of the Qumran sect. These two essays show penetrating theological insight and are among the best in the book. Another essay by Kuhn argues that the texts dealing with the sacred meals at Qumran throw fresh light on the Eucharist. The argument will not convince everyone, but it is undoubtedly worthy of careful consideration. Kuhn's third contribution is a discussion of the belief in two messiahs—an Aaronite high priest and, subordinate to him, a political king.

K. Schubert argues rather unconvincingly that the Sermon on the Mount echoes Essene ideas. More convincing is E. Vogt's brief study of the Qumran background to the phrase "men of God's good pleasure". R. E. Brown contributes a balanced and careful comparison of the Scrolls and the Johannine literature. Sound scholarship is also shown by J. A. Fitzmyer in his study of the Ebionites. Bo Reicke finds at Qumran a combination of monarchy, oligarchy and democracy analogous to that in the early Church. S. E. Johnson claims to detect similarities to the organization of the Church in Acts. N. N. Glatzer tries to relate the Essenes to certain aspects of Rabbi Hillel's teaching.

There are undoubtedly some striking similarities between the Scrolls and the New Testament. This has—probably unnecessarily—led some scholars to advance theories of a direct connexion. W. H. Brownlee suggests that John the Baptist may once have been a member of the Sect. Although the speculations of this theory are somewhat fanciful, it draws attention to one or two genuine similarities between the teaching of the Baptist and that of the Scrolls.

Cullmann, on the other hand, suggests that the Hellenists of Acts were Essenes or a closely related group. His essay is, unfortunately, marred by a number of questionable statements. It is, for example, going far beyond the evidence to assert that baptisms stood at the centre of the cultic life of the Qumran Sect.

Some parts of this book seem to reflect a common tendency to

lump together the Qumran texts, the ancient descriptions of the Essenes and, perhaps, also the Pseudepigrapha, as if they all represented a single stream of sectarian Judaism. This is then compared with the New Testament, without paying adequate attention to other Jewish parallels. This procedure cannot but distort the picture. The identification of the Sect with the Essenes is unproven and, indeed, unlikely in view of Dr C. Rabin's recent argument that the Qumran texts do not command community of goods but do have many affinities with Pharisaism. We must allow for the possibility that sectarian Judaism was much more complex than has often been realized, and that the boundaries between it and "official" Judaism were not always rigid.

Dr Rowley's booklet will undoubtedly prove very useful, in view of some of the more sensational claims that have been made about the relation of the Scrolls to the rise of Christianity. He shows, in a clear and scholarly way, that the Scrolls do not offer a challenge to the Christian faith, though they do contribute to the understanding of the background of the New Testament.

J. A. Emerton.

Cambridge.

Jesus and His Coming. By J. A. T. Robinson. S.C.M. Press. 15s.
The Christian Doctrine of History. By John McIntyre. Oliver and Boyd. 12s. 6d.

Dr Robinson's thesis is that the expectation of a coming of Christ "from heaven to earth in manifest and final glory" has no firm foundation in the teaching of Jesus. He accepted the traditional Jewish eschatological themes of the end of the age, final judgment, and general resurrection, and saw himself as standing in a unique relation to them, but he did not speak of his *coming* except in incarnation, resurrection and (probably) in the visitation upon Jerusalem. The primitive Christian Gospel set forth "a fully *inaugurated* eschatology" in which "All is not yet summed up; yet all that is to be has now been set in motion. . . . The Christ is not expected so much as *expecting*, waiting, till his finished work runs its course. The decisive messianic act itself is complete: there is not a part of it still to come" (pp. 29–30). The doctrine of a second coming is due, Dr Robinson believes, to a crisis in the Christology of the early Church, which hesitated over identifying the ministry, death and resurrection of Christ with "the eschatological event, without remainder" (p. 150). The disastrous consequences of postponing the completion of the coming to a second event are to be seen in the Synoptic apocalypses which represent "the teaching of Jesus already well seasoned, cooked and labelled in the kitchens of the Mediterranean underworld and tricked out in well-defined courses as 'food for the fed-up' " (p. 100). In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, we have "an inaugurated eschatology in all essentials identical with that of the primitive preaching" (p. 162).

This is a *tour de force* executed with something of the fascination

of a detective story, and each chapter of this important book will need and repay careful examination. I find myself attracted by Dr Robinson's conclusions, but I must confess to the feeling one sometimes has at the end of a detective story—that a different approach to the evidence would have saved trouble and produced the same solution. For example, Dr Robinson assumes throughout the main part of the book that the coming of Christ, when associated in the New Testament with the end of the age, necessarily carried the connotation of a return within history, a second event parallel in some way to the incarnation. Of course it has been so interpreted since the second century, but Dr Robinson's whole argument turns on the point that Jesus spoke of the Son of Man "coming" in vindication and visitation when no intra-historical movement down to earth was implied. Is it not then more reasonable to suppose that the widespread and early idea of a future and final "coming" goes back to Jesus, and that he expressed in this way the centrality of his own part in the final consummation of God's purposes, which is also the consummation of his own ministry? And, oddly enough, Dr Robinson does recognize at the end of the book that the *Parousia* idea may have its value if it is thus understood, not as a second event to take place within history, but as part of the eschatological mythology representing the final sovereignty of Christ in glory.

Dr McIntyre's concern is not primarily with eschatology but with the concept of history as the distinctive category by which contemporary theology tries to interpret the Incarnation. He proposes to define history as "meaningful occurrence, and more particularly occurrence the meaning of which is a construct out of certain categories, namely Necessity, Providence, Incarnation, Freedom and Memory" (p. 13). The major part of the book consists of the working out of this proposition, and in the course of the argument the author gives us many helpful and illuminating insights. He is aware, however, of the difficulty involved in speaking of incarnation both as a category by which to define what history *is* and as an event which happens *in* history and does something *to* history, and I am not sure that he succeeds in justifying the former usage. Dr McIntyre has a clear and analytical mind, but his strength is also his weakness. His argument is often presented in too concise a form, and for once I found myself wishing for a longer book. His tendency to use logical terminology to illustrate theological truths sometimes served only to confuse and irritate this reader. For example, Dr McIntyre thus presents Bultmann's denial that prophecies originally applied to one situation can properly be interpreted in relation to quite different events: "That is, if at a time t_a A B is speaking of C D, then historical science will not permit W X to affirm at time t_x that 'really' A B was speaking about Y Z." Despite these weaknesses this is a valuable book and should be widely read.

R. F. Hettlinger.

St Augustine's College,
Canterbury.

THE CHRIST OF FAITH. By Karl Adam. Translated by Joyce Crick. Burns and Oates. 30s.

In a remarkable little book some years ago, *Christ our Brother*, Karl Adam criticized certain tendencies in catholic theology and devotion towards the neglect of the true humanity of Christ—Barth and Heim came under his strictures for similar reasons. We now have the lectures which he has given over many years to his students at Tübingen on the person of Christ.

Faith in Christ, he contends, is not primarily founded upon a set of documents—which would leave the believer at the mercy of the changing currents of biblical criticism—but upon the faith of the pentecostal community, the living continuous faith of the Church. For Karl Adam this, of course, means the Roman communion; but he is like von Hügel in this respect, that he knows all about modern historical and philosophical problems, and is prepared to discuss them in detail. He can therefore give help to people whose presuppositions are very different from his own. It is futile to-day to be intellectually snobbish about apologetics; nothing is more vital than to understand why we believe in Christ—and the large section of *The Christ of Faith* which deals with the New Testament is packed with helpful material. The twentieth century versions of Strauss, such as Bousset, require to be refuted in detail, and this is attempted here with great acumen. Then, if anyone is prepared to take the Gospels as serious historical records, Karl Adam can show them how the Church's faith is implicit in every aspect of the narrative. Nor is the Fourth Gospel used out of proportion as a *deus ex machina*. Perhaps the most striking chapters of the book are those in which the witness of the Synoptic Gospels to Christ's unique consciousness is examined. Even here, the text is used with discrimination; the Marcan, not the Matthaean, is taken as the original of Peter's confession.

Liberal theology has been much criticized in recent years for attempting to discover a basis for faith in the self-consciousness of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God. But this is the very point round which Karl Adam's examination of the Gospels revolves. The difference between him and, say, Harnack is that if one starts from the position that the faith of the believing Church may be *right*, then the Synoptic tradition does afford ample evidence that Jesus was fully conscious, not only of being Messiah and eschatological Son of Man, but of personal identity with God—as when he applies Old Testament phrases about Jahveh to himself, such as Micah's "Behold, I send my messenger before my face".

The dogmatic chapters have a narrower appeal, though they may help some to realize that the two-nature Christology is not the absurd fiction that T. H. Green thought it. The difficulty remains that the categories of Patristic and Scholastic theology are in a sense subpersonal. Karl Adam admits that the chief value of Scholastic Christology is the removal of philosophical objections to the Incarnation. Psychologically, the Incarnation is not impossible to conceive of: we have analogies in the experience of the beloved and the lover,

and of the saint and Christ. The humanity of Christ, with its truly human will revealed in Gethsemane, is very real to Karl Adam.

J. S. Lawton.

Warton.

Witchcraft. By G. Parrinder. Penguin Books. 3s. 6d.

Processes of Growth in an African Church. By J. V. Taylor. I.M.C. Research Pamphlets, No. 6. S.C.M. Press. 3s.

"Shakespeare artificially devotes one play to witches and another to fairies, and a third to a magician, but it is clear that he did not know much about them." Nor, apparently, does anybody, "since all their works are works of darkness, no witnesses are present to accuse them". Nevertheless, to a reviewer who is at least as ignorant as Shakespeare, this book is an illuminating account of popular belief in Europe from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries and in modern Africa, and a valuable assessment of the confessions extorted from accused witches, often under torture. It adds another horrific chapter to the story of man's inhumanity to man; and, at the same time, it disposes (convincingly and at some length) of Dr Margaret Murray's thesis that witchcraft in Europe was the survival of a pagan cult, of which numerous kings of England were sacrificial victims. Official notice of witches was taken in Europe for the first time in 1484, in England in 1560; and the death sentence (already suspended in practice) was legally abolished in England in 1736. European belief in witchcraft was thus a shortlived phenomenon, even if it claimed several thousand victims for the stake; and it seems to have been encouraged more by persecution of alleged witches than by any convincing evidence: just as it has been encouraged in Africa by well-meaning legislation intended to combat not only alleged witchcraft but (mysteriously) the wholly respectable witch-doctors who claim to prevent it. Dr Parrinder makes a firm distinction between witches, witch-doctors, sorcerers, wizards and magic, and points out that much popular, and dictionary, definition is misleading. The Witch of Endor was not a witch. It is better to confine *witchcraft* for those (usually old women) whose souls leave their bodies at night, fly through the air to abominable sabbaths, eat human flesh (in an entirely spiritual manner) and thus eventually compass the death of their victims. They have familiar spirits, usually in the form of domestic animals, who suck their blood and, from supernumerary teats, perhaps their milk. Dr Parrinder does not mention that, when Isaac Newton kept a frog in his rooms for scientific observation, he was accused by other fellows of Trinity of having precisely such a familiar. There is a useful summary of other cults which are *not* witchcraft, and a short psychological and sociological analysis of the causes of the belief.

Writing from Kampala, it is impossible to ignore the fact that the only references to witchcraft in East Africa are to government legislation and, in the bibliography, to two books which mention it in passing. Monica Wilson's *Good Company* might have been added for

an account of witchcraft beliefs among the Banyakyusa of South-West Tanganyika. In Buganda practically all deaths are still due to witchcraft; but as early as 1904 a leading Muganda chief took precautions to prevent accusations of witchcraft at his death, which took place thirty-eight years later; and it is nowadays rare for anybody to take the belief seriously. Among the more primitive Wakonde of Southern Tanganyika the old people still believe in witches; the young laugh at the idea. In contrast, Dr Parrinder's evidence shows the belief as a serious component in the outlook even of educated Africans. It is a matter for investigation why East Africa should be so much more fortunate.

Mr Taylor is well qualified to write about the Church in Buganda. As warden of the Anglican theological college for ten years, he saw deeply into many of the problems faced by the clergy whom he trained; and his six months' field research work in 1956 brought him into even closer contact with ordinary parishioners. This pamphlet is an attempt to set out a few tentative conclusions prior to the publication of *A Study in the Church in Buganda*. The book, which will contain the whole account of his study, should be expected with enthusiasm, for it will contain much of importance which does not find its way into the missionary magazines. It is a little difficult to see why it has been necessary to publish the pamphlet first. Mr Taylor briefly summarizes the growth of the Anglican Church in Buganda from the arrival of the first missionaries in 1877, involving the rapid development of a "responsible Church" which controlled the machinery of native government, and a sort of secular conversion of the greater part of an important tribe. Responsibility was sapped by missionary paternalism, the growth of clericalism, centralization of control and the loss of effective integration between the work of clergy and school teachers on the one hand and, on the other, of both with society at large. The contemporary picture shows a high degree of immorality and pagan practice on the part of nominal church members and the growth of nationalism as an alternative to a Church still dominated by Europeans. On the other hand, many of the new politicians are Christian in very much more than name; and there is a rebirth of responsibility not only in the powerful revival movement, with its emphasis on the importance of the laity, but among ordinary Christians who realize the significance of the choices forced on them by the conflict between Christian and tribal demands in marriage and the family, and by the paramount importance of good-neighbourly relations in village life. Mr Taylor thinks that missionaries, instead of occupying key positions, should "be scattered abroad throughout the whole fabric of the Church". He also wants a spare-time priesthood. In other words, he agrees to a high degree with my own views! This pamphlet should be read in conjunction with Dr D. A. Low's *Religion and Society in Buganda* (East African Studies, No. 8, Kegan Paul, 1957, 3s. 6d., pp. 16).

F. B. Welbourn.

Makerere College.

SHORTER NOTICES

THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. By F. D. Maurice. Introduction by Edward F. Carpenter. James Clarke and Co. 15s.

I do not myself regard the *Theological Essays* as the most rewarding of Maurice's books, but it is satisfactory to know that it is again in print. Dr Carpenter has contributed an admirable introduction to this edition, in which he has supplied not only an outline of Maurice's life but some very perceptive remarks about his work as a theologian. On the other hand, Dr Carpenter does not explain why the second rather than the third edition has been reprinted. Maurice's preface to the third edition of 1871 is important, and no allusion is here made even to its existence. The editor would also have performed a useful service if he had provided a few annotations concerning now more or less forgotten persons and literature that are referred to in the text of the volume. Maurice himself was casual in these matters, and a new edition might have remedied a defect which is more of a handicap to readers now than it was in the last century.

A. R. V.

THE FAITH, HISTORY AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By A. W. Eaton. Hodder and Stoughton. 4s. 6d. paper; 7s. 6d. boards.

The material of this book started life as a timely and imaginative experiment in evangelism in the form of a series of postal instructions. The writer had in mind people with "a willingness to learn"; and for their benefit he gives facts and information and sets them on the way to finding their own information in Bible and Prayer Book. Written questions were invited in the original course, and the conciseness of the teaching suggests that something of the sort would help in the further use of these instructions. The third section of the book, which bases the practice of the English churchman entirely on loyalty to the letter of the Prayer Book, will, I think, cause some heart-searching.

MARGARET KANE.

MALTBY.

THE GITA IN LIFE. By Dorothea Stephen. Christian Literature Society, Madras. Rs. 2.50.

The C.L.S. (which is the Indian counterpart of the U.S.C.L.) has published several brief but scholarly studies of ancient and modern Hindu thought from the standpoint of Christian belief, of which this is one. The tendency in the resurgent Hinduism of to-day to look to the *Bhagavadgita* as its primary scriptural authority gives this book an added importance for the understanding of the contemporary religious situation in India.

T. S. GARRETT.

TIRUMARAIYUR.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: Bernard Kelly, *The Metaphysical Background of Analogy* (2s.); David Knowles, *The Historical Context of the Philosophical Works of St Thomas Aquinas* (1s. 6d.).

BROWNE AND NOLAN: Alfred O'Rahilly, *Gospel Meditations* (18s.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: William Grossouw, *Revelation and Redemption* [an introduction to the Fourth Gospel] (8s. 6d.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *The Convocations and the Laity* (2s. 6d.).

CHURCHES' COUNCIL OF HEALING: A. S. Reeve and R. W. Luxton, *A Prescription for Health* (1s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St John* [a re-issue of the commentary on the English text with an introduction by Dr Adam Fox] (18s. 6d.); Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will* [a new translation with an historical and theological introduction by J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston] (15s.).

COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS: Alexander Altmann, *Tolerance and the Jewish Tradition* (2s.).

ECUMENICAL INSTITUTE OF THE COMENIUS FACULTY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY IN PRAGUE: *The Struggle against Thermonuclear Weapons as a Task of the Church* (n.p.).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL: Dénise and Robert Barrat, *Charles de Foucauld et la Fraternité* (frs. 390).

EPWORTH PRESS: Rupert E. Davies, *A Colony of Heaven* [a commentary on Philippians, from broadcast talks] (5s.); Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* (6s.).

FAITH PRESS: Herbert Waddams, *Believing* (8s. 6d.); Doris Thompson, *Priest and Pioneer* (15s.).

C. A. WATTS AND CO.: Ronald W. Hepburn, *Christianity and Paradox* (18s.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Authority* (3s.); J. I. Packer, *"Fundamentalism" and the Word of God* (4s. 6d.); J. R. W. Stott, *Basic Christianity* (3s. 6d.); A. M. Renwick, *The Story of the Church* (4s. 6d.); Leon Morris, *The Lord from Heaven* (4s.); A. Rendle Short, *Why Believe?* [revised edition] (3s.).

LONGMANS: E. L. Mascall, *The Recovery of Unity* (25s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: J. Robert Nelson, *One Lord, One Church* (2s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: W. R. Inge, *Goodness and Truth* (13s. 6d.); J. G. Davies, *Members One of Another—Aspects of Koinonia* (3s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: G. K. A. Bell (Ed.), *Documents on Christian Unity, Fourth Series*, 1948–1957 [a further sixty-four extracts in this valuable series of volumes] (21s. cloth; 10s. 6d. paper); W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* [second edition] (40s.); Albert C. Outler, *The Christian Tradition and the Unity we Seek* (12s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: E. H. Robertson, *Man's Estimate of Man* (8s. 6d.); Alec R. Vidler, *Windsor Sermons* (15s.); J. Davis McCaughey, *Christian Obedience in the University* (25s.); John Lawrence, *Hard Facts* (3s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: Marthinus Versfeld, *A Guide to the City of God* [an introduction to St Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*] (10s. 6d.); Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (25s.); F. J. Sheed, *Theology for Beginners* (10s. 6d. cloth; 5s. paper).

S.P.C.K.: R. H. Malden, *Christian Belief* [reprint in the Seraph Series of a book first published in 1941] (3s. 6d.); K. E. Maclean, *A Religion for Monday Morning* [reprint in the Seraph Series of a book first published in 1926] (4s.).

S.P.C.K. (FOR THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY): James Bulloch, *Adam of Dryburgh* (30s.); F. R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland* (45s.).

THAMES AND HUDSON: E. O. James, *Myth and Ritual in the Ancient Near East* (35s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

Faith Press

ANGLICANISM and EPISCOPACY

A. L. PECK

The Vice-Master of Christ's College and author of *This Church of Christ* returns to the subject of the Episcopate. The first part of his book consists of a re-examination of Professor Sykes's *Old Priest and New Presbyter*. He reconsiders the position of post-Reformation Anglican writers with regard to foreign non-episcopal ministry. Later he discusses validity more fully and urges that a proper understanding of it can be achieved only when it is discussed in personal terms. 16s. net

The Faith Press
7, Tufton St.,
London, S.W.1

Westcott's

ST. JOHN

A REPRINT OF A FAMOUS COMMENTARY
WITH A NEW INTRODUCTION BY THE
ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER

18s 6d net

From all Booksellers.

JAMES CLARKE & CO., 33 STORE ST., LONDON, W.C. 1

THE FAMILY IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

10s. 6d.

The unanimous report of a distinguished group convened by the Church of England Moral Welfare Council at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The purpose of the Report is to help the Church in the discharge of its duty in relation to some of the problems confronting the family and society in different parts of the world. The thoroughness of the Report; the fearless facing of issues too often avoided, and the Christian responsibility evident in the handling of intricate and vital problems combine to make this an important and relevant study.

ANGLICAN METHODIST CONVERSATIONS

3s. 6d.

The Official Report of conversations between representatives of the Church of England and the Methodist Church. Ready 8 July.

Published jointly with the Epworth Press

S·P·C·K